

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated December 27, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-45 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 19, 29, 38, and 44 are independent. In the Office Action dated December 27, 2006, Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Claims 1-12, 15-22, 28-41, and 43-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102, and Claims 13-14, 23-27, and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Following this response, Claims 1-12 and 14-45 remain in this application with Claim 13 being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. **Rejection of Claims 3 and 4 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

In the Office Action dated December 27, 2006, the Examiner rejected Claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention. Claims 3 and 4 have been amended to change "the voiced call" to "the verbal scheduling request" to correct antecedent basis. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-12, 15-22, 28-41, and 43-45 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 1-12, 15-22, 28-41, and 43-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0035493 ("*Mozayeny*"). Claims 1, 19, 29, 38, and 44 have been amended and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "formulating a query to a schedule database based on the received verbal scheduling request to determine whether the request is compatible with a current schedule of the schedule database, wherein formulating the query comprises, accessing a profile for the customer from a profile database to determine preferences for the customer, and including the preferences in the query to determine whether the request is compatible with the current schedule, wherein including the preferences comprises, when information is omitted in the query, accessing the profile database, searching the preferences to complete the query, and including the preferences in the query to complete the omitted information." Amended Claims 19, 29, 38, and 44 each includes a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 13, lines 17-24.

Consistent with embodiments of the present invention, an application server may formulate a query to a scheduling database to determine if a request is compatible with a current schedule. (See specification page 13, lines 17-18.)

The query may be formulated based upon request data keywords that may have been received from a voice services node. (See specification page 13, lines 19-20.) When the request omits or has yet to provide some information that may be included in the query, the application server may access a profile database to search for a requesting party preferences' that may be used to complete the query formulation. (See specification page 13, lines 20-23.) The application server may obtain the customer preferences' from the profile database. (See specification page 13, lines 23-24.)

In contrast and as stated by the Examiner, *Mozayeny* at least does not disclose including preferences in a query. (See Office Action page 10, lines 5-6.) Because *Mozayeny* does not include preferences in a query, it cannot include the preferences in the query to determine whether a request is compatible with a current schedule.

Consequently, *Mozayeny* does not anticipate the claimed invention because *Mozayeny* at least does not disclose "formulating a query to a schedule database based on the received verbal scheduling request to determine whether the request is compatible with a current schedule of the schedule database, wherein formulating the query comprises, accessing a profile for the customer from a profile database to determine preferences for the customer, and including the preferences in the query to determine whether the request is compatible with the current schedule, wherein including the preferences comprises, when information is omitted in the query, accessing the profile database, searching the preferences to complete the query, and including the preferences in the query to

complete the omitted information,” as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claims 19, 29, 38, and 44 each include a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 19, 29, 38, and 44 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1, 19, 29, 38, and 44.

Dependent Claims 2-12, 15-18, 20-22, 28, 30-37, 39-41, 43, and 45 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1, 19, 29, 38, and 44, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1, 19, 29, 38, and 44. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-12, 15-18, 20-22, 28, 30-37, 39-41, 43, and 45.

III. Rejection of Claims 13-14, 23-27, and 42 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 13-14, 23-27, and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mozayeny* in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0004772 (“*Dutta*”). Dependent Claims 13-14 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least for the reason that they include, due to their dependency on amended independent Claim 1, “formulating a query to a schedule database based on the received verbal scheduling request to determine whether the request is compatible with a current schedule of the schedule database, wherein formulating the query comprises, accessing a profile for the customer from a profile database to determine preferences for the customer, and including the preferences in the query to determine whether the

request is compatible with the current schedule, wherein including the preferences comprises, when information is omitted in the query, accessing the profile database, searching the preferences to complete the query, and including the preferences in the query to complete the omitted information.” Dependent Claims 23-27 and 42 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least for the reason that they include, due to their respective dependencies on independent Claims 19 and 38 similar recitations.

Consistent with embodiments of the present invention, an application server may formulate a query to a scheduling database to determine if the request is compatible with a current schedule. (See specification page 13, lines 17-18.) The query may be formulated based upon the keywords of the request data that may have been received from a voice services node. (See specification page 13, lines 19-20.) When the request omits or has yet to provide some information that may be included in the query, the application server may access a profile database to search for preferences of a requesting party that may be used to complete the formulation of the query. (See specification page 13, lines 20-23.) The application server may obtain the preferences of the customer from the profile database. (See specification page 13, lines 23-24.)

In contrast and as stated by the Examiner, *Mozayeny* at least does not disclose including the preferences in the query. (See Office Action page 10, lines 5-6.) In addition, *Dutta* does not overcome *Mozayeny*'s deficiencies *Dutta*. *Dutta* merely discloses by creating a backup queue, a potential user submits requirements under which the user would be interested in a reserved resource.

(See paragraph [0030], lines 1-4.) *Dutta* state that these requirements are the conditions under which the potential user wants to be notified in the event the present is canceled. (See paragraph [0030], lines 4-6.) For example, in *Dutta*, one of these requirements could be notification time, in which the user is not interested in the reservation, if the notification occurred within a certain time of the reservation. (See paragraph [0030], lines 6-9.) When creating the backup queue, in *Dutta*, a record is created for each potential user and placed in the backup queue. (See paragraph [0030], lines 29-32.) *Dutta* is silent regarding completion of omitted information. Because *Dutta* is silent regarding completion of omitted information, *Dutta* does not disclose including preferences from a profile data to complete omitted information that may be included in a query.

Combining *Mozayeny* with *Dutta* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Mozayeny* and *Dutta*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose “formulating a query to a schedule database based on the received verbal scheduling request to determine whether the request is compatible with a current schedule of the schedule database, wherein formulating the query comprises, accessing a profile for the customer from a profile database to determine preferences for the customer, and including the preferences in the query to determine whether the request is compatible with the current schedule, wherein including the preferences comprises, when information is omitted in the query, accessing the profile database, searching the preferences to complete the query, and including the preferences in the query to complete the omitted information,” as included in dependent Claims 13-14. Dependent Claims

23-27 and 42 include similar recitations. Accordingly, dependent Claims 13-14, 23-27, and 42 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 13-14, 23-27, and 42.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and further examination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and
charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

Date: February 22, 2007



D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:ARL:kek

